

Dreadnoughts from the Canadian standpoint for coastal protection would be white elephants on our hands. A navy such as that proposed consisting of four Bristols, one Boadicea and six destroyers is certainly the most practical and useful from the Canadian standpoint, and for these and many other reasons I propose to support the Bill now before the House for the establishment of a Canadian navy.

Mr. A. S. GOODEVE (Kootenay). Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to weary the House by giving long extracts from the opinions of naval experts in order to crowd the pages of 'Hansard' with matter that is already on record. But, after listening carefully to the speeches which have been delivered on both sides of the House I propose to give some reasons, why, in my opinion, we should oppose this Bill and vote for the resolution introduced by my hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden). In reference to the hon. member who has just taken his seat (Mr. Sealey) I can only say that he has made one of the strongest appeals apparently that could be made to the government benches, namely, the appeal of the loaves and fishes. He has told them how the money will be expended in Canada, and how they will reap direct personal benefit from the expenditure of that money. That may appeal to a certain number of people, but I do not believe that the great Canadian people as a whole can be appealed to by an argument of that kind. As it seems apparent that no speech on the naval question can be made without reference to that great historical character, Peter the Hermit, I shall commence by referring to what was said by the right hon. leader of the government (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Referring to that character, he spoke of his wonderful ambition and eloquence and he reminded us that by means of that eloquence he had been enabled to gather together a large army of men in order that they might rescue from desecration by the Mohammedans the tomb of our Saviour. It proved, however, to be a failure. The reason of the failure was the lack of discipline, training and unity. But the right hon. gentleman failed to apply that to himself when he told us, with wonderful eloquence, of all the glories of the British empire. But, in the next breath he stated that in his opinion we could better aid the empire by having a navy of our own; in other words, that if we in this country undertook to have a navy separate from that of the empire it would end just as the great army of Peter the Hermit ended in disastrous failure. Again, I find that the leader of the government quoted with great favour from the poet:

Mr. GOODEVE.

Daughter am I in my mother's house
But mistress in my own.
The gates are mine to open
As the gates are mine to close.

But, Sir, I ask what would be thought of the daughter nursed at the mother's breast, nurtured in a mother's arms, shielded and protected by a mother's love and strength, until her house was thoroughly established and her children had grown into manhood and womanhood. Then, when the mother felt she was justified in asking the daughter's aid in protecting her own and her daughter's home, she should shut the gates in her mother's face. I ask you, Mr. Speaker, what would be thought of such a daughter? Yet, Mr. Speaker, the right hon. First Minister said he could conceive of such a case. I confess, I cannot. He said, page 3044, 'Hansard':

If Britain is at war, we are at war and liable to attack. I do not say that we shall always be attacked, neither do I say that we would take part in all the wars of England. That is a matter that must be guided by circumstances, upon which the Canadian parliament will look to pronounce and will have to decide in its own best judgment.

But, Mr. Speaker, he went further. He proceeded to give an illustration in which he, by inference, said he would not hesitate to 'shut the gate' in the mother's face. He referred to the history of the Crimean war, and these are his words:

I would hesitate very much before I would give my consent that we should take part in any such war.

But he piously added:

The conditions are not the same now as they were then; we have British Columbia to look after.

I would like to ask, Mr. Speaker, how the right hon. the leader of the government proposes to look after the province of British Columbia? The British admiralty asked that there should be a Canadian unit placed on the Pacific to co-operate and work in unison with the China unit and the India unit, so that the empire might be safe-guarded on the Pacific. But what was the answer of the delegates sent from this government, and of the leader of the government himself? They said: We are unable to do that; we are not satisfied to be incorporated in that manner. Not only is that his policy as set forth by the leader of the government, but we find that the official organ of the government, the Toronto 'Globe,' took the same stand, and wrote:

And this question as against Britain has its Canadian counterpart. It ought to be said distinctly and with emphasis, that Britain's obligation to share in quarrels of Canada's making is also nullified by self-government and self-respect. If Canadian politicians